DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 546 JC 690 436

AUTHOR	Stockdale, William A.
TITLE	Summaries of the Meetings of Group F of the Seminar for Great Teachers at Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine, August 17-27, 1969.
INSTITUTION	Minnesota Univ., Minneapolis. General College.
PUB DATE	69
NOTE	32p.
JOURNAL CIT	Professional Development Review; v4 n1 Fall 1969
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.70
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports, *Educational Interest, *Junior Colleges, *Student Reaction, *Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

The American Association of Junior Colleges sponsored "A Seminar for Great Teachers" during August 1969. The participants were divided into groups that met three times each day for nine days. This report describes the discussions of group F. The 11 members were teachers of various subjects at different colleges. All were concerned with holding the interest of both slow and fast learners in their classes. During group meetings, the teachers described unique methods for teaching their subjects successfully. One member had a technique for personalizing history lessons; another returned biology tests only at personal interviews with the students. A Spanish teacher used dramatization to catch her students' interest. Innovative methods for teaching literature and speech were described. One teacher had an "incentive grading system" that enabled students to cancel out poor grades by showing improvement on the final exam. The teachers recognized a need for junior college faculties and students to establish a positive identity, rather than occupying an inferior position between high school and university. The merit of course and teacher evaluation by students was discussed. (MS)

ED034546

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Volume IV Number 1

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT REVIEW

Fall, 1969

Contents

Foreword i

Editor's Note ii

Summaries of the Meetings of Group F of the Seminar for Great Teachers at Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine, August 17-27, 1969 . . 1
WILLIAM A. STOCKDALE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES
DEC 04 1969
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

JC 690 436

This publication is sponsored by the Professional Development Committee, a standing committee of the faculty of the General College, University of Minnesota, Mary L. Wyvell, Chairman. Cover design by Louis Safer.

Editor. . . Mary L. Wyvell
Editorial Office: 206 Nicholson Hall
University of Minnesota

THE GENERAL COLLEGE

FOREWORD

The American Association of Junior Colleges sponsored a seminar for teachers this past summer. Called "A Seminar for Great Teachers" in the literature disseminated about it among the junior colleges by Roger Garrison, its instigator and director, it was held at Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine, August 17-27, 1969, where Professor Garrison teaches English literature and composition.

The participants, divided into six discussion groups of eleven to twelve members, met each day in three sessions, each session lasting for one hour and a half. In the evenings the six groups gathered in a general session. Every group had a discussion leader assigned to it. The general sessions were conducted by Professor Garrison.

As discussion leader for one of the groups I had to prepare the following summaries of its meetings. As the summaries make evident, my leadership role was almost entirely nominal. The members of the group needed no leadership--just a straight man and clerk to ask a leading question now and then, to sum up the dialogue from time to time, and to carry out the mundane task of recording each day's give and take.

For most if not all of the participants the adjective "great" in the seminar's title had an ironic mordancy to it. Aware of the countless frustrations and limited successes indigenous to their trade, they weren't given to viewing themselves as splendid and glorious pedagogues. Yet as I recall their most salient characteristics and attitudes, I'm convinced that Roger Garrison hadn't resorted to inexcusable hyperbole when he chose the title "A Seminar for Great Teachers".

Though they might be allowed their reservations about the epithet "great", they nonetheless demonstrated, time and again, that they are mature, ingenious, enthusiastic practitioners of their calling. Knowledgeable and adroit, they have mastered their subject matter, have insight into their students and themselves, and have unique and impressive repertoires of devices for teaching their subject matter to their students. Some evidence of their knowledge-ability and skill is to be found in these summaries of the meetings of one of their groups.

William A. Stockdale

Editor's Note:

Professional Development Review is happy to devote its opening issue of 1969-70 to William Stockdale's report of a most unusual and stimulating conference. Professor Stockdale's participation in the "Seminar for Great Teachers" in itself is a source of pride to us in the General College. Besides, his account of the proceedings contains much of interest to us as teachers. We are grateful to him for sharing his experience with us.

Summaries of the Meetings of Group F of the Seminar for Great Teachers
at Westbrook Junior College
Portland, Maine, August 17-27, 1969

Monday, August 18, 1969

The members formed their chairs into a large circle and began talking. Each introduced himself, told the others where and what he taught. Very quickly after the introductions the last traces of formality, inevitable in the initial stage of acquaintanceship, disappeared. Casually, easily, with low-key enthusiasm (the participants had ideas--pet ones--but none wished to thrust his rudely upon his new friends) the pedagogical attitudes, problems, frustrations, insights, satisfactions began getting aired. It was decided that the group leader was to be just another member of the seminar; like the others, he could speak his thoughts and make suggestions, but he'd better remember he wasn't there to prescribe to his peers. Listed below are the names of the members of the group, their teaching fields and the institutions they represent:

Brandyberry, Ardon — Biology
Hutchinson Community Junior College, Hutchinson, Kansas

Dye, Victor — Psychology
Wright College, Chicago, Illinois

Gottshall, David B. — Russian-German
College of DuPage, Glen Ellyn, Illinois

Lynch, Aline — Business Education
Delta College, University Center, Michigan

Mandeville, Clarence L. — History-Philosophy
Iowa Western Community College, Clarinda, Iowa

Marrits, Edward — Political Science
Community College of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Pannill, Margaret — English
Navarro Junior College, Corsicana, Texas

Rocha, Ashby (Mrs.) — Spanish
Westbrook Junior College, Portland, Maine

Roethel, Louis F. — Mathematics
Nassau Community College, Garden City, New York

Seales, William C. — Social Science
Morton College, Cicero, Illinois

Stockdale, William — English
General College, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Once the group had settled in, it was suggested that members go around the circle once more, each person giving a brief sketch of his college--its size, the characteristics of its students and staff and whatever other qualities the speaker wished to mention that give it its individuality. Like the person speaking for it, each institution, it became clear, had its uniqueness. The colleges vary in size, their enrollments ranging from less than a thousand to more than ten thousand. Some are in large urban centers, others in or near middle sized cities, still others in small, predominantly agricultural communities. One of the institutions is in effect a lower division for several four-year institutions in its vicinity, since a majority of its students eventually transfer to them. On the other hand, another school admits no one whose entry test scores and high school rank place him above the fiftieth percentile.

Despite the diversity of the schools they taught in, the members of the group found they had common pedagogical concerns: how does one teach relatively slow and fast learners in the same class without frustrating both; how can students -- all of them -- be inveigled into wanting to learn, be drawn into an active and voluntary pursuit of learning; how can large numbers of students be taught in a single class without affronting their individuality?

The last question proved transitional. Louis Roethel said the teaching innovation he wanted to present to the group -- one which has been adopted in the mathematics department in his college (Nassau Community College, Garden City, New York) simultaneously serves to reduce teaching loads and makes possible more individual contact between students and their instructors. The other members of the group turned to his dittoed description of his department's innovations in scheduling. He then described them orally and answered numerous questions concerning them.

The scheduling inaugurated by his department is of incalculable value, particularly in a time of burgeoning enrollments, because it enables an instructor to teach larger numbers of students in less time and still get to know them and work with them individually. It combines lectures, meetings in seminars and meetings in tutorials -- all three conducted by the same instructor. Mr. Roethel also distributed copies of the Mathematics Department Guide Book, prepared by the chairman of the department for the use of his staff.

Tuesday, August 19, 1969

Group F -- facetiously alluded to as F Troup by witty non-members -- devoted its two morning sessions to a discussion of an innovative teaching method described by Clarence Mandeville of Iowa Western Community College. Mr. Mandeville presented an ingenious technique for getting students' minds and imaginations under the umbrella of history, even though they may prefer the haze and murky rain of ignorance. His instructional ploy, though deceptively simple in its conception, demands imagination and pedagogical skill for its successful execution. He starts with his students in the home pasture, then adroitly moves them to contiguous meadows. For example, he may point out to the sons and daughters of farmers who throng his classes the nexus between today's farm subsidy programs and the restrictions on tobacco production in an earlier century, thereby enabling them to see how the plight of their fathers parallels that of the colonial farmers. He distributed to the members of the group a letter he often hands out to his class in American history -- a letter written to the editor of the Chicago Daily Tribune in 1926 by the wife of a farmer in which she sets forth in vivid, moving narration and description (it would have earned her an A+ in any freshman composition section on any campus in the land) the woes of the midwestern farmer. Almost needless to say, it must hold the rapt attention of any contemporary Iowan farmer's offspring as closely as it held ours. Once the letter grabs the students' attention, Mr. Mandeville is off and running on the farm problem and his students stay with him, as closely as they can.

As he admits, his happy innovation was conceived in initial pain and not without expense of spirit. In his own words, "I have had to eliminate my once rigid adherence to impeccable chronology and to the traditional sequential topical approach in teaching history; I have eliminated precise lecture outlines for 'scraps of paper' containing only salient points for instructor elaboration or class discussion. I have eliminated many 'cherished' topics of history highly interesting to me but of no real use to students; I have attempted to personalize history with primary resources or recently published current-affairs articles thereby giving flesh and blood contemporariness to social and economic history." Understandably, he convinced us that he is not just an historian enthralled by subject matter. We recognized that he is also a teacher skilled in inveigling his students into sharing his interest in history and even some of his grasp of its elusive complexities.

Not at all surprisingly, his presentation stirred discussion and questions among the troops -- discussion and questions that ranged close to his subject at times, and at times far to its front and flanks. How many students does he have in his contemporary problems course? How many of them become actively involved in the class discussions? How do teachers pinpoint what interests students, and what element of their search for it represents trial and error? One of the subjects out on the right flank of Mr. Mandeville's presentation was that of teacher training: how much of our training is garnered informally? In what ways has it been formalized and under what circumstances does its formalization result in stultification? Most of us concurred that much teacher training is given informally and that it depends for its quality on the dedication and savvy of senior members of our faculties. If old hands are willing to help beginning teachers, informal training is often of considerable worth. As Margaret Pannill, a pedagogue remarkable for her insight and succinctness, stated it, "We don't need much machinery for such training; what's needed is interest!"

The morning session drew to a close with a search for some of the qualities of personality and character which distinguish good teachers. Members of the group agreed that outstanding teachers are sympathetic -- even empathetic -- patient, open-minded, enthusiastic. Mr. Ardon Brandyberry added by way of quiet climax that they possess a strong self-image -- can accept themselves with an equanimity untinged by complacency and don't tend to succumb to tension in moments of stress. He added that he wished to distribute an article on the implications of the self-concept for teaching and learning at the beginning of the afternoon session.

At the opening of the afternoon session Mr. Brandyberry distributed copies of the article he had spoken of earlier -- "A Child Psychology Specialist Examines the Implications for Teaching and Learning of the Self-Concept" by Dr. Don E. Hamachek of Michigan State University, which appeared in The Kansas Teacher, March, 1969, pages 31-34. He suggested that we might want to read it before discussing it at tomorrow morning's session but that he would be making references to brief passages in it during his discussion of an innovative practice he follows in his biology classes.

Mr. Brandyberry, who is given to understatement and shrewd indirection, assumed a role he obviously enjoys playing and plays with skill. Unobtrusively, he became the devil's advocate for the indirect good of pedagogy. Perhaps his opening statement startles one: "One of the things I do is to not hand

back some of the tests I give. The students are invited (and often requested) to make appointments within groups of two to five. We sit down together in my office and go over the test question by question. This works well on all types of questions but it is especially effective on discussion questions since I can explain (or defend) why I graded the way I did and it also gives the student a chance to explain his position. More than this, though, it gives us the opportunity for that person-to-person contact that is so often missing in college teaching."

He admitted that few students -- not more than 15 percent of them -- would review their examinations with him if he returned them before they came to his office. But by having them come to his office to receive and review them he was able to have conferences with 90 percent of them. Without question, he coerces them, but it would be difficult to gainsay that he does it gently and benevolently -- and with that foxy indirection which is one of his most apparent traits.

When interrogated, Mr. Brandyberry confessed: he uses the review of the examinations for devious ends -- tutoring and counseling. Very quickly he let the cat out of the bag. One couldn't evade the inference that he suspects that what often passes for the educational process is in its most virulent form destructive of students' self-esteem and in its least harmful form an inhibitor of it. He raised once more those two questions many educators would prefer to ignore. Do we "program students to fail" and "are teachers just certifiers"? Another member of the group, Mr. Gottshall, added a third -- "does college interrupt education"?

Once again the group was off, asking questions and seeking answers to them even though some of them may have no mortal answers. What about testing? Do standardized tests promote learning? Many were dubious. Can tests be used as instructional tools? Yes, but such tests require painstaking preparation. Some members of the group recounted testing strategies they had tried. How about counseling? What is it and in whose hands and under what circumstances is it of service to students? Some horror stories were narrated: teachers who didn't let students have their tests back and a remedial program so ill conceived that it can't help and may harm the slow learners it is intended to serve. At the close of the afternoon meeting it was clear that Mr. Brandyberry had accomplished his devilish purpose. The group had confronted some unsettling specters on the educational horizon.

Wednesday, August 20, 1969

Hamachek's article on the self-concept, distributed to the members of the group the previous afternoon by Mr. Brandyberry, gave impetus to Group F's first session of the day. What image do the junior colleges -- particularly their students and teachers -- have of themselves? How do they view themselves in relation to the other institutions comprising the educational scene in the United States?

Most agreed that the self-image was not a complacent one. Many of the high school graduates who enroll in junior colleges have been told, directly and by indirection, that they are not good students. All too frequently they have been "programmed to fail." Teachers when attending professional meetings with representatives from four-year institutions are given to understand (more often tacitly than by direct statement) that they are the untouchables of the higher educational caste system.

But the self-images of the individuals comprising the group were too robust for them to wilt before these generalizations. They could perceive exceptions and distinctions which qualify these concepts. Not all junior college students see themselves as refugees from four-year institutions. A member of the group from an institution where a majority of the students transfer to four-year institutions after completing their lower division requirements, pointed out that the students have delayed transfer to save money because tuition is much lower at his college than it is at neighboring four-year institutions. Another (he has taught at two junior colleges and has observed undergraduate and graduate instruction at universities both as student and instructor) affirmed that junior college instruction is more conscientious, skillful, and patient -- and that many junior college students are aware of this reality. Several members said that they had detected changes in the attitudes of four-year institutions in recent years toward the junior colleges in which they teach. The neighboring four-year schools are coming more frequently to them seeking students. The private colleges particularly are "feeling the pinch for more and better students." As more and more junior colleges open their doors, growing numbers of students, motivated by geographic and economic considerations, choose to begin their educational careers in junior college classrooms.

Like their students, junior college faculty members sometimes possess self-images beclouded by ambiguities. As one member perceptively observed,

junior college teachers are to some extent the victims of polarization. In the western world men tend to regard anything or anyone found between extremes as existing in limbo, and junior college faculty members find themselves regarded (hence often regard themselves) as occupying a limbo between secondary school and four-year college teachers. Another said that people in the community frequently ask when the college where she teaches is going to become a four-year institution. All recognized a need for junior college faculties to establish independent identities.

Nor was there any pronounced difference of opinion as to how such identities could best be made a reality: national organizations for junior college teachers by disciplines should be established, quite separate from those for secondary school and four-year college teachers; and good teaching should be maintained as the criterion for recognition and reward in junior colleges, much as research is in professional and graduate schools. It was observed, too, that teaching and subject matter ought not to be polarized. As one member of the group said, they're grammatically inseparable; one term is a verb and the other a noun: "one should teach subject matter."

After the mid-morning coffee break Mrs. Ashby Rocha described a course in Spanish in which she has her students employ creative problem solving strategies and the techniques of method acting to acquire conversational fluency.

The rationale of her course is one which the members of Group F had already found they held in common: Since students are most likely to learn that which they are interested in, the teacher's challenge is to simulate in the classroom situations and incidents which students either have known and valued or value and wish to know. Learning, she reasoned, begins when a student's interest is caught; and it continues as long as the teacher can provide experiences that will hold it. Hence the challenge to the teacher is to bring to the classroom a series of problems which students want to solve because the solutions are pertinent to the way they want to live after they complete college. Her objective was to set up a series of situations so that the student both wished to and could solve the dilemmas in them. The teacher must design these problems with care -- and beforehand. In the classroom he becomes an evaluator and informal prompter.

Mrs. Rocha gives her students simple conversational problems at the outset. But from the first day on she steeps them in Latin American culture.

For instance, she will show a slide of a street or a park in a Latin American city, then ask a student to describe specifically and completely (in Spanish, of course) the objects depicted in it. Next she will have two students memorize a brief dialogue in Spanish, then act out the dialogue. Employing as they do both speech and gesture -- Latin gestures as well as Spanish verbal structures -- they are on their way to becoming as Latin American as one can on the Westbrook Junior College campus in Portland, Maine. In these dialogues one person familiar with a city may instruct another unfamiliar with it how to get from one location to another; their sole prop will be a map -- their only means of communication, Spanish words and gestures. Or they may carry on a phone conversation -- one acting out the role of a woman who wishes to terminate the conversation, the other of a man desirous of continuing it.

As the semester progresses, the skits become longer and include increasing numbers of participants. However, every skit simulates an experience which the students are likely to encounter in a Latin American setting. Many of Mrs. Rocha's students plan to become airline hostesses. Hence a skit may have as its setting the cabin of a plane and the participants will act out roles as stewardesses and passengers.

Supplementing their theatrical assignments, the students read contemporary Latin American magazines and prepare written assignments. But this homework too is role playing which has immediacy, for the reading is the kind that they would do if they were Latin American citizens, and the written assignments call upon them to imagine themselves as Latin Americans writing personal letters to Latin American friends or relatives or as Latin American secretaries writing business letters for Latin American business firms.

Clearly, Mrs. Rocha's role in this course keeps her from moving front and center in her theater-classroom. For most of the semester she serves as prop woman, prompter, director and drama critic. The students are the playwrights and actors, though admittedly she may have to help them select a plot or doctor a drama now and then when they call on her for such assistance. But by the end of the semester she has withdrawn herself from all roles except that of drama critic. For the final examination each student plans a twenty-minute monologue and demonstration and Mrs. Rocha, the critic, evaluates it for effectiveness.

During the afternoon session Mrs. Rocha described still another innovation she uses to grab her students' attention at the start of a semester and hold it through the ensuing units of the course. Though her procedures differ in

her course in Latin American culture (it is not a Spanish language course), her pedagogical axiom is identical with the one she held when constructing her course in conversational Spanish: provide a series of experiences which will draw and hold the student's interest; don't appeal to his intellect alone; with a dramatic incident or demonstration simultaneously capture both his intellect and his sympathies; then hold these with a sequence of related experiences which have immediacy for him.

To realize this formidable objective, instead of serving as a dramatics coach as she does in her conversational Spanish course, she asks others on the faculty to team teach the course in Latin American culture with her. Instead of offering a traditional lecture on the appalling public health problems in Latin America, she invites a colleague in biology to mount slides for her students in his microscopes so they can observe some of the parasites that infest people in the various areas of Latin America. Instead of just telling them that great numbers of Latin Americans are badly nourished, she asks her colleague who teaches nutrition in the dental hygiene program to discuss and demonstrate the specific dietary deficiencies that plague the masses of people in most Latin American countries. And instead of generalizing about Latin America's political, industrial and agricultural dilemmas, she has guest lecturers come into the class to discuss these in depth. Then to give the lectures and projects further vividness she illustrates them with appropriate films and slide demonstrations.

Several participants (some prepense, but others in part or whole as a consequence of Mrs. Rocha's presentation) expressed conviction that a cultural approach to the languages and the humanities is the one most appropriate for junior college curricula. None present evinced greater enthusiasm for the cultural and dramatic approach to the teaching of languages than Warren Blaisdell, the president of Blaisdell Publishing Company. He invited Mrs. Rocha and David Gottshall, the other foreign language teacher in the group, to have lunch with him and discuss the possibility of their preparing texts for publication which incorporate a cultural approach in the teaching of Spanish and Russian to junior college students. Perhaps it is needless to add that Mrs. Rocha's presentation inspired energetic discussions about other topics as well -- such topics as team teaching, instructional skill, and the rating of instructors by their peers, the administrators in their colleges, and their students.

Thursday, August 21, 1969

Because members of Group F had expressed interest in seeing junior college teachers develop their own professional organizations, the group invited Mr. Derek Singer, the director of the AAJC's faculty development project, to discuss with it the steps being taken by the AAJC to promote the development of organizations to serve the junior colleges.

Mr. Singer, an articulate and forthright individual who understands as a result of first-hand experience how power is exercised in the organizational mazes of this land, pointed out that teacher organizations in American higher education divide into two categories: those with an economic orientation and those with a professional or subject-matter orientation. He confirmed what the members of the group on the previous day had suspected and deplored: discipline-oriented groups for junior college teachers are neither numerous nor strong; and most of those existing for four-year college and university teachers demonstrate little concern for two-year college teachers. He cited two exceptions: the National Council for the Teachers of English (NCTE) and the College Conference on Composition and Communication (4C's) welcome junior college composition and speech teachers to their ranks since, whether it is being done in a junior college or in the lower division of a four-year college, the teaching of these skills is a common cause.

When questioned about what is being done for teacher development by the AAJC, Mr. Singer replied that his project, funded by the Carnegie Foundation until March, 1970, is both service oriented and research oriented. In his brief term in his present post he has prepared articles to guide individuals who are considering entry into careers as junior college teachers. He cited two of these: "Preparing Two-Year College Teachers", which appeared in a recent edition of the AAJC Journal, and "An In-Service Training Guide for Two-Year College Teachers". Also he and his small staff are designing and conducting surveys to assess the instructional needs of the junior colleges and the needs of the teachers offering the instruction. One of these is "a study of the felt needs of institutions for the training of teachers"; another is "a survey of the felt needs of instructors"; and a third is "a surveying of what training of teachers is taking place in the colleges".

Mr. Singer's remarks to the group included information other than that summarized above. In addition, he gave an informal status report on the activities of the economically oriented teacher organizations (e.g., NFA, NHEA,

AAUP, etc.) and outlined the economic and administrative structure of the AAJC. Since he repeated that information for all of the participants in these seminars at the general session on Friday, August 22, 1969, it is being omitted from this summary.

Mr. William Searles got the second morning session (the final session of the day since no meeting was scheduled for Thursday afternoon) underway with his presentation of an instructional innovation he introduced in his history classes two years ago and has continued to use because he found it successful. Mr. Searles (a man whose lugubrious pessimism would have disturbed the equilibrium of his audience if it were not so exactly counterbalanced by substantial idealism and unswerving dedication to his students and his profession) gloomily averred, though, that the experiment has been a flawed success.

Often, of course, we teachers submit questionnaires to our students in order to get their evaluation of the courses we teach. But Mr. Searles does not wait until the close of the semester. As his classes finish each unit of a course he teaches, the students evaluate it. Such a procedure provides benefits not gained in conventional terminal evaluations: 1) if the course is headed agley, the instructor can correct his azimuth reading en route; and 2) the evaluative procedures themselves prompt the students to review the unit carefully and in detail. Thus the teacher learns how to improve his instruction and the students reinforce what they have learned.

But, he gloomily added, it takes fortitude to confront their evaluations with such frequency -- and not in consequence of negative remarks about his teaching. By and large he finds them "kind" in their evaluation of him. (It should be mentioned that his institution, Morton Junior College, Cicero, Illinois, asked its students to participate in choosing its representative to this seminar.) It's what the questionnaires reflect concerning students' educational values and attitudes that proves "very depressing" to a teacher of Mr. Searles' mournful mien. When queried as to what makes them so, he sorrowfully answered that the responses are often "chaotic" and "repetitious" -- that students aspire more often than not to have shorter assignments, not different or better ones, and fewer and easier tests, not more pertinent ones.

Mr. Searles' presentation set the group to discussing some themes never far from their thoughts, hence oft recurring in the course of the seminar: student and teacher responsibilities, course and teacher evaluation, and student interest in learning. Perhaps students should share a more active responsibility with teachers for what transpires in the classroom, Mr. Dyer said, but since they usually have been conditioned to expect teachers to

initiate all pursuit of learning, it's not surprising that they are nonplussed and not fully a match for the task when a teacher such as Mr. Searles asks them to give him suggestions as to how and where the course should be directed. Mr. Brandyberry ventured the opinion that students find a psychic salubriousness in course and teacher evaluation: it's a handy sluice for normal hostilities. Their criticism can prove of benefit to an instructor in the design and presentation of his courses, particularly if he has the objectivity which is a concomitant of a strong self-image; the evaluation form is at the same time an escape valve for what might, if no channel of release were provided, be carried as self-blame which they should not or could not tolerate. The emotionally secure teacher can differentiate between their trenchant, worthwhile criticism and exculpation by means of scapegoating.

Mr. Roethel distributed copies of the teacher evaluation form filled out each semester by students enrolled in mathematics courses at Nassau Community College. He said that as a rule teachers' ratings show no significant variation from semester to semester. When a significant change appears it often can be accounted for. He recalled that one semester the rating of a teacher previously regarded as a very good teacher by his students took a marked drop. Later it was learned that he'd been having domestic troubles and was involved in litigation for a divorce.

Several questions surfaced in the cauldron of discussion. What are the ethical implications of teacher and course evaluations? How may administrators fairly and reasonably employ them in determining salaries, promotions, tenure? How can teachers use the information from them to improve their courses and their teaching? How can teachers draw students -- ideally, all their students -- into an active and positive interest in the courses they enroll in? This last question perhaps recurred more frequently than any other in the meetings of the group throughout the seminar.

Mr. Roethel said, as Mr. Mandeville and Mrs. Rocha had before him, that students are most likely to become interested in what they are studying in the classroom if they can see its relevance for them beyond the bounds of college. He described the general mathematics course offered by his department for students with a non-mathematical orientation. In it students learn "a non-mathematical approach to the structure of the numbers system" and come to some understanding of how that system functions as an essential of their cultural environment. They acquire insight into the binary system and the principles of probability, and learn how a computer operates. From the course they gain insight into the processes of mathematical reasoning and discover

how pertinent these are to them as members of a "technologized" society. As he had when describing the innovations in course scheduling, Mr. Roethel conveyed to the other members of Group F a sense of pride in the quality of teaching and administration to be found in the mathematics department in which he teaches. He presented his information with such lucidity and incisiveness that the other members of the group inferred that if he is a typical representative of it, his department must be as outstanding as he assumes it to be.

Mr. Searles, with his gift for throwing into stark relief the dramatic elements inherent in any social and political situation, furnished the statement which gave the first morning session its impetus:

> Five suburbs make up the residential community of Morton College. They are so like Chicago that the visitor crosses corporation lines unaware. The people of these blue collar Slavic ethnic ghettoes, however, painfully aware of the racial barrier dividing them from the city, frown across it distrustfully and receive the same looks in return. Strengthened in attitude by a heavy immigration of Latins, refugees from the Black Tide rising on the East, they crouch together in xenophobic dread, worship the status quo, and cling to the delusion that nothing can change.

The attention of his fellows arrested by the graphic imagery of this prologue, Mr. Searles delineated the consequences of community opinion for his college.

A politically and economically conservative community supports a College Board which is its alter image. Complacency reigns and probably will continue to "so long as the machine maintains the lowest school tax rate in the Chicago area . . . ." School administrators, as conservative as the board members they're beholden to, attempt to hire new members to the teaching staff who also are politically conservative. On those rare occasions "when a teacher becomes actively involved in social issues, ways are found to discourage his continuing tenure."

The question raised by Mr. Searles is one confronting all teachers, though many of us do not teach in a community whose social tensions quite so sharply dramatize it for us. Must a community college give that community -- particularly its taxpayers -- exactly what it wants? To a considerable degree he made the question rhetorical, for he implied a partial answer. He and his colleagues are not subservient to community opinion: "The Social Science Department is the agitation center for change. The instructors are instantly suspect, for they take classroom time to discuss controversial local issues. . . . The Social Science Department keeps a steady pressure on the Board and Administration in its endless list of complaints, requests for 'dangerous' course additions, and press releases which bring in dozens of anonymous phone calls."

Even in Cicero, Illinois, the social structure is not entirely monolithic.

Mr. Searles, whose colossal pessimism gets rugged checks from his objective intellect, recognizes that pluralism still persists in his college. He and his colleagues are not entirely vulnerable when challenging the conventional wisdom of the community. They have their union as a countervailing force. "One of [their] most effective tools of offense and defense is the grievance procedure section in the collective bargaining agreement negotiated by the school's very strong local of the American Federation of Teachers." And to some extent they have their students whose conservatism is less extreme than that of their parents. Though what he says about their attitudes is predictably gloomy, it's not all stygian blackness: "Students are less conservative than their parents, but few express any enthusiasm for progressive change. They tell, rather, of their eagerness to move away once they are independent."

When asked to cite evidence of the students' lesser conservatism, Mr. Searles recounted an incident indicative of more questioning of community values than is implicit in the previous quotation. In a virtually all-white school confronting "the Black Tide rising on the East", more than 150 students petitioned to have a course in Afro-American culture added to the curriculum. Though the petition met opposition from administrators and the course was not permitted to be offered for credit, so many students wished to take it on a non-credit basis that Mr. Searles ahd his colleagues joined forces to team-teach it in addition to their regular classroom assignments.

During the second morning session Group F discussed 1) power relations within the two-year colleges themselves and between the colleges and the communities from which and for which they have their institutional existence and 2) the distinction (if one there be) between education and training.

Most agreed that the power relations between the communities and their colleges and within the colleges tend to resemble those already sketched by Mr. Searles. College boards generally represent the more conservative elements of a community, college administrators often prove subservient to their boards, among teachers just a small minority ever challenges the authority of their administrators, and students rarely call into question the classroom procedures of their teachers or the authority of their administrators. Exceptions were brought to the attention of the group: at the demand of the majority of his faculty a junior college president in Minnesota removed from his position, student activism on some two-year college campuses in a few large urban centers. As yet the shifts in the balance of power occurring in four-year and graduate institutions (shifts which have shown administrators to have less authority

than had been assumed, faculties to have more than they had realized but not sufficiently united to exercise it, and students -- at least the activists among them -- wanting more power and quick to exercise what they have in an effort to gain more) have not become pronounced in two-year institutions. The discussion resulted in a number of conjectures and questions (e.g., Does relative quiescence among students reflect satisfaction with curricula and instruction? Is the balance of power shifting from administrators and toward faculty and students?) but no clear-cut conclusions.

The discussion of whether a difference in kind exists between training and education developed as the result of allusion to another topic sometimes debated by those concerned with post-high school education: should technical and vocational education be combined with general or liberal education, or are the two so unrelated to one another that they should be kept separate? Those who wish to keep the two apart are likely to aver that the former constitutes <u>training</u>, the latter <u>education</u>, and that the two must not or cannot converge. Little difference of opinion arose among the discussants; just one held that there is a significant difference between education and training. For the others the difference in the two terms lies primarily in what they connote, not in what they denote. Both denote learning or knowledge which serves a desirable purpose; but education connotes a purpose which is general, perhaps vague, neither immediate nor applicable; whereas training connotes a purpose which is specific, for an end which can be realized here and now by applying the skill and knowledge one has mastered in his program of study.

The significance of the discussion, however, lies not in any niceties of definition. There were none. Rather, it lies in the fact that ten out of eleven two-year college teachers do not regard the liberal arts as innately superior to technical and vocational programs -- a state of affairs which may surprise most teachers imparting instruction in technical and vocational programs. Even more surprising, nine of the ten teach subjects which are traditionally grouped among the so-called liberal arts.

At the afternoon meeting Margaret Pannill discussed with the group some of the instructional problems she has met during her teaching career and outlined a pedagogical strategy she devised to cope with one of these problems.

Her chief preoccupation is with what she calls "the ever-present problem" -- the problem of cultivating attitudes and acts of independence among her students. Her goal in teaching is, to quote her, "reducing the student's dependency on

the instructor". She sees the teacher as a guide and a resource person for students as they carry out projects they have, in consultation with the instructor, taken upon themselves. In her judgment, they find most rewarding the discoveries they make for themselves. It's better, she believes, to let them "by indirections find directions out" than to lead them by the hand to preconceived goals that she has set for them.

Hence in her classes in English literature she refrains from indulging herself by talking lengthily about those writers who have stirred her enthusiasm for literature. She holds lecturing about them and what they have written to a minimum because she knows that when teachers lecture a lot students don't participate much. Instead she sets up specific research procedures which make it possible for students to acquire knowledge about and insight into literary works of their own selection. Then, guided by her "indirections", they prepare short reports which are presented to her in writing and/or orally to the class. The reports lead into class discussions directed by the reporting student.

Her presentation of her method of teaching literature and her objective of eliciting independent student behavior bared a patch of nettling pedagogical problems. Miss Pannill took the lead in the discussion by posing the big problem interrogatively: how does one go about "creating an intellectual atmosphere on the campus so that students are encouraged to do independent study beyond the limits of assignments"?

No one denied that two-year institutions confront unique problems -- particularly in the degree of their intensity -- when seeking to encourage independent study. Independent study requires added preparation and more time for individual guidance, but in the two-year colleges teaching loads are relatively heavy and student-teacher ratios are comparatively high. Undergraduate assistantships are in short supply and graduate assistantships nonexistent. The library facilities at many colleges are limited. Frequently schools are without their own bookstores, and even when bookstores are to be found, they often lack the non-textbook paperbacks encouraging independent reading and study.

Despite these impediments to independent study, the members of the group were in no sense defeatist about its pursuit. They felt that teachers -- realizing fully that they would have to take the additional time and preparation out of their own hides -- should introduce it into their classes whenever appropriate and feasible. One member expressed an enthusiasm for independent

study projects at least as great as Miss Pannill's. He would like to see teachers in different disciplines work together with students, helping them design and carry out cross-disciplinary research projects. Since his colleagues had already shown themselves to be proponents of team teaching and cross-disciplinary instruction, his imaginative proposal received approbation.

The afternoon session closed with a spirited, albeit somewhat indecisive, discussion of teacher training for two-year college teachers. While it was recognized that few formal programs for the training of junior college teachers are extant and though several felt that such a program could be worthwhile, no one tendered a master plan. A number were sure of one kind they did not favor: one modeled after the teacher training programs which aspiring primary and secondary school teachers undergo. Seven persons in the group remembered an informal mentor -- some experienced colleague -- who had given them valuable guidance during the early stages of their careers. None faulted the practice teaching which is a part of conventional teacher training. But it was felt that in its present form the supervising teacher can misuse and even abuse his authority; a system of relationships in which classroom vulnerability is shared more equally by the tyro and the master teacher should be sought. And none would have student teachers subjected to the how-to courses which have gained noxious reputations in many colleges of education. Just one person had firsthand knowledge of a teaching internship program in which the beginners and the supervising teacher observe one another in the classroom and on video tape, make notes about each other's teaching styles and, later, gather for critiques on each other's teaching. A supervising teacher in such a setting is even more vulnerable than his interns; none but a teacher with a strong self-image can survive in such a role. But if he can accept the challenge, almost certainly both he and his interns will hone their pedagogical skills to a finer edge.

David Gottshall opened the meeting. How might information concerning innovations in curricula and teaching methods in the two-year colleges best be circulated among the faculty members of the various institutions? He would like to see a central clearing agency founded to collect from and disseminate among the various institutions their syllabi, course descriptions and instructional experiments. Could these seminars, he wondered, be instrumental in its establishment?

The questions he broached were sobering. They compelled the group to confront the overwhelming reality of the size of the two-year college movement--its sheer numbers. And of course its growth is not about to stop in the near future. It was pointed out that Roger Garrison, who had imaginatively and single-handedly established and nurtured this seminar, could hardly find the time and means to get underway and maintain such an interchange of information. Some of the information Mr. Gottshall wishes to have disseminated is available through the Los Angeles branch of ERIC, the computerized information center for literature about the junior colleges. Though some remained skeptical about the feasibility of an information exchange of the scope Mr. Gottshall had in mind, no one questioned its potential worth. It was assented that his proposal should be written into this summary of the meetings of Group F. Until this fuller exchange of information can be inaugurated, it is to be hoped that individual institutions and teachers will do all they can to disperse such information among other teachers and colleges. One member of the group reported that his college publishes an occasional journal containing articles about teaching innovations tried by teachers at his institution and elsewhere, and that the editorial board of the journal would welcome articles from staff members at any two-year institution in the land.

Much of the rest of the meeting was given over to one more variation on a recurrent theme: how to bring students to a discovery of the appositeness of what they do in their classes to what they aspire to do beyond them. Alice Lynch recounted "an eclectic approach" she utilizes at Delta Community College, University Center, Michigan, to draw and hold her students' participation in the courses she teaches in business communications, secretarial practices, office management, and filing and records management. Since the students in her courses have varying backgrounds and interests, she tries to help them single out those concerns they share and those skills each must master in order to

reach the goals they have set for themselves in and beyond the classroom:

> In community college classes, I find the students have widely different interests, different reasons for being in a particular class, and that background experiences vary . . . . Therefore, I attempted to find a common interest. After much search, I felt that "communications" is of the greatest importance to all people, and that every student would have something "special" to contribute--and that the subject itself would stimulate interest.

Miss Lynch knows that for decades business students have been required to take composition and speech courses with the trite admonishment that "it will help you in 'the world of business'". And all too often they have suffered through these courses, since only the most imaginative among them have observed a nexus between their course work and "the world of business". She knows that when writing and speaking are directly related to problems of commerce and management, few of them can fail to see the link. And she knows more: like her colleagues in speech and writing who are alert to the literature in their field, she is cognizant that in this age of electronic media there is more to communications than the visual and oral symbols of language; and like her most alert colleagues in educational psychology, she realizes that just "giving assignments" to passive receptors is not the only way--and frequently not the best way--of assuring an active response.

She begins her courses as a speech teacher might with class discussion--and ultimately a tentative definition--of communications. Once she has elicited from students their active awareness of the processes and problems of presentation and reception (they are usually surprised and pleased to discover that they already possessed latent knowledge about them), she draws from them some of the ways communications is pertinent to them in everyday life and, most importantly, the specific ways in which it is relevant to the subject matter of the particular course they are taking with her.

Once the relevance of communications has been established, Miss Lynch shifts her role somewhat. Up to now she has been front and center as the leader of class discussion. At this point she sets the students to organizing class projects, returning to the front of the room to direct discussion only when the class is reviewing a completed project or series of related projects. For the most part, her classes employ four methods in encompassing the units of a course:

1) Brainstorming on methods of communication. The results might range from writing in stone, or smoke signals, through panels, discussions, debates, brochures, displays, radio, television, telstar, etc.!

2) Use of committee work, and some class discussion, throughout the semester, to determine individual or group projects, to reach the course coverage and objectives, through the aid of communication media.

3) Presentation of materials by individuals, or committees, making use of planned, traditional, or technical, audio or visual means, or a combination of methods.

4) Discussion of subject for facts and implications; and as well, discussion of the effectiveness of the techniques used; and also, an explanation of the method used to develop the project or lesson.

In evaluating her innovative tack in the teaching of business studies, Miss Lynch exhibits professional caution. She stresses the subjectivity of her evaluation, emphasizes that its "outcomes" have not been "scientifically tested." Yet she feels confident that these "outcomes" are more worthwhile than they would be if she taught these courses in a more traditional manner:

1) [Students demonstrate] greater interest, since the subject matter was built on previous knowledge and upon a receptive attitude.

2) Because much of the work is done and presented by the students' peers, in somewhat of a competitive manner, the material covered will probably be retained for a longer time.

3) The challenges bring about more research, and more discussion, both inside and outside the classroom.

4) Mutual respect for the skills, knowledge, and attitudes of the student members of the class, and faculty member, and the many persons contacted outside the classroom, were a result of the interaction.

Miss Lynch's program has quantitative as well as qualitative implications, since twenty-five percent of her institution's several thousand students (the college serves a tri-city commercial and industrial area) enroll in business studies programs. Nor is hers the sole innovation in her department. Business students also participate in a work-study program enabling them to work and attend school simultaneously.

Currently, the major problem of instruction at her institution, Miss Lynch said, is "how [the faculty] can teach most effectively the students entering our community college whom we might classify as 'deprived' . . . ." She

presented convincing evidence that the college intends to devote its institutional resources to the education of disadvantaged students and that it has made herculean efforts to determine how it can intelligently and effectively meet their educational needs. One item of evidence is a list of specific questions the administration and faculty are seeking answers to regarding the teaching of the disadvantaged (e.g., "Should the student be placed in 'blocked-time' situations, where there would be fewer adjustments to faculty members, class membership, and long-term objectives?"). Another is a well-organized, carefully researched paper prepared by the college's dean of instruction while he was a participant in a seminar on education for the disadvantaged, held at the University of Chicago. In all likelihood, few two-year institutions have moved with as much alacrity as hers in assuming responsibility for the education of disadvantaged students. The information she presented was of particular interest in light of the fact that no other subject posited for discussion in the general sessions of the seminar stirred as much emotion or brought forth as much heated reaction as that of education for the disadvantaged. Witness the responses in the general sessions of August 21 and 24 (the negative ones often sotto voce) after Frank Douthwaite recounted his experiences working with young black ghetto dwellers in the San Francisco Bay area and after Sister Bernice Moellering told about her experiences teaching black students in North Carolina this summer.

Monday, August 25, 1969

As sessions often had during the previous week, this one began with a question, this time from Mr. Brandyberry. How does one sell his colleagues on innovations? None of us, he recognized, believe in introducing them for mere novelty, as an end in themselves. They have value just insofar as they draw the interest of students and give impetus to learning. He innovates in his teaching and will continue to. At present he's planning to set up a multi-media laboratory for his classes in biology. But how does one gain the co-operation of his colleagues in undertakings like that?

Like many preceding it, this question drew no categorical reply. Tangentially and implicitly it served as a reminder that students are not the only human variables in the art and craft of teaching. Other personalities -- faculty members, administrators, board members, parents, the whole of society -- may and often do impinge on all experiments in the classroom. It's not likely that education can soon become an exact science in view of the limits to the controls teachers have over the environment in which they essay experimentation. But there were some suggestions regarding the practice and intent of pedagogical statesmanship. Mr. Roethel suggested that informal exchanges of information and ideas among faculty members can result in a general acceptance of innovations. The chairman of his department (he had convinced us earlier of his chairman's administrative talent and political acumen) convinces others over a cup of coffee of the worth of changes he wants inaugurated. Mr. Gottshall said that he has seen innovations introduced quietly which have gone unchallenged and gained tacit acceptance. Such a procedure calls for exact discernment because of its inherent riskiness. Announced change may prompt resistance, but unannounced change may in addition beget outrage. Miss Pannill affirmed that a seminar like this one ought to reinforce our intentions to concentrate our energy and tact toward bringing to pass those changes we judge essential upon returning to our various colleges.

The remainder of the morning the group listened and responded to David Gottshall's presentation of a major problem of instruction for all teachers of second languages: "eliminating the 'matching' stage in foreign language communication". A student, he said, doesn't know a second language until he thinks in it -- until he ceases "matching" words in his native tongue with words in the language he is attempting to master or, to quote Mr. Gottshall's more precise and technical phraseology, "until he can both transmit and receive

oral and written thought in a foreign language without first having to attempt to fit the content to his own lexical and syntactical patterns." A teacher must at the outset bring his students to realize that

1) the number of "words" (a term not as yet adequately defined) in a given utterance in language "A" does not necessarily match the number of words in the corresponding utterance in language "B";

2) the semantic scope of a word in language "A" does not necessarily match the scope of the corresponding word in language "B";

3) a large portion of communication is achieved through idioms, and idioms are, by definition, relatively meaningless when interpreted literally, word for word;

4) under normal circumstances communication is neither composed nor analyzed at the word level, but rather at the level of macrosegments of varying dimensions.

But once students are cognizant of what they must do to master a foreign language, the problem remains of providing an environment adequate to the doing of it. Total immersion -- a year abroad, say, to study the language in the country it's indigenous to -- is not practicable. Like Mrs. Rocha, he recognizes that the best alternative to total immersion is a simulation of the cultural setting of which the language is a part. This, though, is difficult to achieve in a public two-year college where students remain on campus for minimal periods of time each day.

Mr. Gottshall asked for ideas. What strategies might others propose for rescuing students from the dilemmas of having to "learn a foreign language more or less in the abstract, with no long-range exposure to continuous and comprehensive communication conducted in his target language"? Mr. Roethel made some suggestions. Why not try total immersion in a simulated environment for an entire semester? That is, have students enroll for fifteen credits in their foreign language, taking nothing else in addition to it during that semester. How about using the break between semesters for an intensive catch-up program for students whose performance during the semester just ended had been marginal? Would animated cartoons with a sound track in the appropriate language be of value in oral drills? Another member of the group said he was sure that Mr. Gottshall, thoroughly grounded as he is in linguistic theory and practice, had several strategies at hand for teaching students to speak

and write in a second language.

His hunch proved correct. Mr. Gottshall knows well the professional literature and the methodology for teaching students a second language and has taught three of them -- Russian, German and English -- as second languages. He clarified for the group the strategy called "information milking", used to give students drills leading to a mastery of "controlled" units of structure and vocabulary. But his request for suggestions of teaching strategies had been no put-on. He relentlessly seeks new ideas for teaching from laymen and professionals alike. Often the good ones come, like Mr. Roethel's, from people who are not language teachers.

Later in the day Mr. Gottshall explained the "incentive grading system" he has introduced into his classes because he finds it to be "a useful teaching device". More often than not, he believes, the slow starter becomes discouraged during the first few weeks of a quarter or semester because of the low grades he receives on his first few quizzes and tests. He "loses his incentive and drops the challenge, knowing full well after a few grades that he is doomed in advance by the cold arithmetical process of deriving averages." On the other hand, "the quick starter, if he lacks any other incentive, will do far less than his best in the absence of any serious threat to his foothold on the high end of the curve." Since he has both slow and fast starters in his classes, Mr. Gottshall chooses to determine the grades of his students in such a way that they will give incentive to the slow starters throughout the semester and, at the same time, encourage fast starters to maintain their initial pace.

> This disastrous state of progressive disinterest can be prevented with the announced application of two simple formulas in the determination of final grades for the course.
>
> 1) If a student's grade on his last exam (whether a comprehensive "final" or not) is <u>as high as</u> or <u>higher than</u> the highest grade he received on any previous exam in the course, the last exam grade will be his final grade for the course; for example: C-B-D-D-B = B; B-F-C-B-A = A; (unlikely) F-F-F-F-A = A. (This is quite fair, since a final grade for a proficiency-oriented course should reflect the proficiency of the individual at the time of grading; it is absurd to penalize a student for not being proficient in the past!)

2) If a student's grade on his last exam is <u>not</u> as high as or higher than the highest previous grade, he receives the standard mathematical average.

When the students are made aware of this system early in the semester, the slow starters rarely stop trying, because they are never at some point in time automatically, unmistakably and irreversibly doomed; the quick starter rarely slows down, because everyone is now a potential threat to his position.

Discussion of Mr. Gottshall's formula (it met with approbation, some of it qualified and some of it not) for sundering a portion of doom from the grading system led to an exchange of comments about grading practices in the several colleges represented by the group. Though the traditional practices in no two were identical, all had characteristics in common. No one offered a strong brief for grades, recognizing that academic justice, like legal justice, is not unflawed. Some members of the group dislike grading the academic performances of their students because they feel that grades are always in some degree an affront to their individuality, their uniqueness. Pondering, perhaps, over all the compromises teachers make (grading among them), Mr. Mandeville, a man of ideals, asked if there may not be some element of farce in institutionalized education. Mr. Gottshall and Mr. Stockdale allowed there is.

Tuesday, August 26, 1969

During the first morning session the members of Group F moved among the other five groups as observers, much as the other groups had observed Group F and one another on previous days.

When they returned to their own seminar room for the second morning session, Victor Dye, who is a psychologist and a counselor, spoke briefly about the use of games to bring students to a concrete grasp of concepts which would otherwise remain abstract and hazy. Operant conditioning, for example, is a concept in psychology which many students cannot comprehend until they participate in some activity which dramatizes it as a process.

> Operant conditioning is a concept which lends itself well to this [game] approach. Students who play the games are conditioned; they learn the meaning of the concept fairly rapidly. A game I have used for operant conditioning is much like the children's game of hiding the penny. The student who is "It" leaves the room while someone hides the penny. When "It" returns to the room to look for the penny, he is given reinforcement by other students indicating "Warmer" or "Colder", as appropriate, as he moves about the room. The penny is hidden in the same place each time until "It is conditioned to go directly to the coin... without reinforcement....
>
> The game has the advantage of involving the student actively. The game serves... to provide an observable behavior which can be discussed. One of the problems is to convey to the students a more theoretical understanding of the behavior. This can be done in small group discussions.

The device, Dr. Dye recognizes, has a limited usage. Each game must be confined to the specific concept for which it has been devised or to which it has been adapted. But in his opinion all course work should be designed painstakingly to produce and reinforce a precisely conceived behavioral repertoire. The objectives of a course--and likewise of the discrete units comprising it--must be clear to instructor and students alike; and the instructor must guide his students to those objectives, providing a maximum of "positive reinforcement" along the way.

No doubt his discipline, psychology, is the font of Dr. Dye's assumptions about the structuring of the pedagogical process. But they are assumptions which have been "reinforced" by what he has discovered about the students he teaches and counsels. He knows that the conditioning many of them received and are still receiving outside of college is antithetical to their presumed

educational objectives.

> Most of the students in my college come from lower middle class white, ethnic homes. The parents frequently do not support, either financially or emotionally, the educational endeavors of their children.
>
> The students often have very strong attitudes which cause them to resist learning. They are particularly resistant to understanding the social issues and the methods social scientists use in investigating and solving problems in society. The students are often without high level skills in reading and analyzing, which means that study is frequently unrewarding.

Since he sees so clearly that many students have been "programmed to fail", he has become almost preternaturally aware of the need to program them for success. It was his turn to give a tug at the strand which had run unbroken through the seminar's days: "The most difficult problem... is to present the material... in such a way as to stimulate the student so that he lends an inquiring mind to the learning experience."

His words were sobering. Given the wide spectrum of backgrounds, interests and aptitudes of the students who throng the two-year colleges, how are teachers going to meet the enormous challenge of getting all of their students to lend "an inquiring mind to the learning experience"? Despite their most ingenious efforts, motivation will remain a thwarting challenge for even the most creative and gifted teachers, since their influence is minuscule compared with that of all the other institutions and their representatives impinging on students' lives. When they come to college freshmen are no longer analogous to Montaigne's bear cub, ready to be licked into shape. For good or ill, as Dr. Dye's statement makes one mindful, much of the crucial shaping has taken place prior to their matriculation.

The subsequent comments by the members of the group reflected both their concern with the formidable problem of motivation and their will to cope with it. Mr. Mandeville asked if we didn't have to face the issue as to whether all students should be in college. Can the two-year colleges, which are many things to a lot of people, be all things to all of them? He and Mr. Gottshall said they hoped the time would not come when students would be required to attend college as they are now required to attend high school. Miss Lynch pointed out that a growing number of employers are demanding that a larger proportion of the labor force produce certification of formal education beyond high school;

the tendency to substitute formal training for informal, on-the-job training is increasing. Mr. Roethel said he feels that certificate programs are certainly within the purview of the two-year institutions--that he wishes his college gave them emphasis. But he also believes that many trades, many skills, can best be learned in apprenticeship programs. Might not some of those students unmotivated by college programs find the apprenticeship system congenial? Mr. Dye said he thinks they would because the relationship between apprentice and master is more personal and thereby provides greater reinforcement for the apprentice; it has the advantages of the tutorial method. He added that role playing is another instructional technique which personalizes instruction and brings students to discover congruencies between what they experience on campus and beyond it. The hands of the clock signaled the close of the morning session in mid-discussion.

The afternoon session was brief. It was opened with an expression of regret that Mr. Edward Marrits had been unable to participate in the closing days of the seminar; because of an emergency he had returned to Philadelphia during the previous week. The members of the group submitted written statements to be turned over to Roger Garrison, the seminar's initiator and director. In their statements they had set forth their responses to the seminar and their recommendations concerning the advisability of and the structure for another one. Mrs. Rocha said that instead of visiting the other group sessions during the morning, she had prepared a formal topic outline of the subjects discussed in the informal sessions of the group during the past nine days. She asked if the group members wished to include a copy of it in the folder of materials to be given to Mr. Garrison. The members assured her that they would and thanked her for giving a perimeter to their rambling discussions over the nine days. They then adjourned.

William A. Stockdale
Professor of Literature and
Writing